



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,418	09/05/2003	Hiroshi Yamaguchi	242220US6	5828

22850 7590 11/04/2010
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

WHIPPLE, BRIAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2448

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/04/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 are pending in this application and presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 9/13/10, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claim 9, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claim 9 has been withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 9/13/10, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claim 11, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The presence of a processor alone does not exclude software implementations, as the specification as filed does not eliminate virtual processors or software-based processors from being included in an interpretation of a processor. The applicant is advised that the presence of a memory in a system claim typically excludes software-alone interpretations.

4. Applicant's remaining arguments, see pages 8-11, with respect to claims 1-11, have been considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

7. As to claim 11, the claimed embodiment may be interpreted as software per se. For example, the claimed mechanisms, detector, processor, and connector may be implemented in software modules (see page 69, ln. 6-14 of the specification, “the above series of processes may be performed using software”). Software fails to fall into one of the four statutory classes of invention: process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kavacheri et al. (Kavacheri), U.S. Publication No. 2004/0030746 A1, in view of Blewett et al. (Blewett), U.S. Patent No. 7,131,141 B1, further in view of Stracke, Jr. (Stracke), U.S. Patent No. 6,167,451, and further in view of Official Notice (See MPEP 2144.03).

10. As to claim 1, Kavacheri discloses an information processing apparatus having an interface for connection with networks (Fig. 2), the information processing apparatus comprising:

detecting means for detecting a first phase connection to a detected network

(Abstract, ln. 1-6);

determination means for determining whether the managing means manages a managed entry corresponding to the detected network when the detecting means has detected the first phase connection to the detected network ([0097]; the initial connection to determine if an exact match for the client can be found may be interpreted as the first phase connection to the network); and

establishing means for automatically establishing a second phase connection to the detected network based on the managed entry if the determination means determines that the managing means manages the managed entry corresponding to the detected network

(Fig. 6; [0060]; [0062], ln. 1-3; [0102]; the subsequent loading of client data from cached entries may be interpreted as the second phase connection to the network),

said establishing means including a switcher configured to switch access to the detected network using the first phase connection and the second phase connection when a predetermined condition is determined to exist (Abstract; [0062], ln. 1-3; the first phase connection of providing relevant client information is switched to a second phase connection as a result of the "hierarchal search" identifying "appropriate device specific templates").

Kavacheri is silent on managing means for managing settings for connectable networks as profiles on a network by network basis;

means for judging whether the detected network has actually changed;

when the means for judging judges that the detected network has actually changed;

the managed entry being a managed profile; and

said switcher includes an icon display mechanism configured to produce an icon on a display that notifies a user that the switcher is an active process.

However, Blewett discloses managing means for managing settings for connectable networks as profiles on a network by network basis (Abstract; Fig. 1A; Fig. 1C; Col. 6, ln. 62-66); and

the managed entry being a managed profile (Abstract; Fig. 1A; Fig. 1C; Col. 6, ln. 62-66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kavacheri in the aforementioned manner as taught by Blewett in order to provide secure connections based on a standard means of storing information on users or devices, such as profiles.

Kavacheri and Blewett are silent on means for judging whether the detected network has actually changed;

when the means for judging judges that the detected network has actually changed;
and

said switcher includes an icon display mechanism configured to produce an icon on a display that notifies a user that the switcher is an active process.

However, Stracke discloses means for judging whether the detected network has actually changed (Col. 1, ln. 20-27);

when the means for judging judges that the detected network has actually changed (Col. 1, ln. 20-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kavacheri and Blewett in the aforementioned manner as taught by Stracke in order to increase efficiency by reducing unnecessary traffic across the network (Stracke: Col. 1, ln. 20-27).

Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke are silent on said switcher includes an icon display mechanism configured to produce an icon on a display that notifies a user that the switcher is an active process.

However, Official Notice is taken that a switcher including an icon display mechanism configured to produce an icon on a display that notifies a user that the switcher is an active process was well known in the art at the time of the invention. Displaying an icon or notification graphic to a user based on active processes was well known (e.g., displaying a notification in the system tray when a network connection is switched, for example, to another wireless network).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke in the aforementioned manner as was well known in the art in order to display information to a user via a convenient means in a graphical user interface.

11. As to claim 3, Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, wherein the detecting means detects, as the first phase connection, a connection to a detected gateway that manages a network (Blewett: Col. 10, ln. 14-22),

wherein the determination means determines whether the managing means manages a profile relating to the detected gateway (Blewett: Col. 10, ln. 14-22; Col. 11, ln. 18-29 and 53-55), and

wherein the establishing means establishes the second phase connection to the detected gateway in accordance with the managed profile relating to the detected gateway (Blewett: Col. 11, ln. 53 – Col. 12, ln. 18).

12. As to claim 5, Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, wherein using an IP address, the determination means determines whether the managing means manages the managed profile, relating to the detected network detected by the detecting means (Blewett: Col. 11, ln. 18-29 and 53-55).

13. As to claim 6, Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, wherein if the interface of the detected network is one of a wired LAN interface and a wireless LAN interface, the first phase connection is a connection to a gateway that manages the detected network, and the second phase connection is a connection to another apparatus through the gateway (Blewett: Fig. 1A; Col. 3, ln. 25-38), and

wherein if the interface of the detected network is a modem, the first phase connection is a connection to an ISP, and the second phase connection is a connection to another apparatus through the ISP (Blewett: Col. 3, ln. 17-21 and 38-42).

14. As to claims 8-9 and 11, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 1 above.

15. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Ogle et al. (Ogle), U.S. Patent No. 6,052,736.

16. As to claim 2, Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, wherein the detecting means detects the first phase connection to the detected network (Blewett: Col. 11, ln. 18-29), but is silent on the detecting step occurring by determining whether or not a routing table is modified.

However, Ogle discloses the detecting step occurring by determining whether or not a routing table is modified (Col. 6, ln. 11-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke by determining

whether or not a routing table is modified as taught by Ogle in order to reduce the overhead associated with creating and maintaining a routing table (Ogle: Col. 5, ln. 37-50).

17. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Beck, U.S. Patent No. 6,671,273 B1.

18. As to claim 4, Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, wherein the detecting means detects the first connection to the detected network (Blewett: Col. 11, ln. 18-29), and determining whether the managing means manages the profile relating to the detected network detected by the detecting means (Col. 11, ln. 18-29).

Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke are silent on counter means for counting up by one when the detecting means detects the first phase connection to the detected network, and

zero determination means that determines whether a subtracting of one from the count of the counter means makes zero when the detecting means detects the first phase connection to the detected network,

wherein the zero determination means determines whether the managing means manages the managed profile relating to the detected network detected by the detecting

means when the zero determination means determines that subtracting of one from the counter of the counter means makes zero,

wherein the establishing means establishes the second phase connection to the detected network in accordance with the managed profile relating to the detected network while the zero determination means determines that the subtracting of one from the count of the counter means makes zero.

However, Beck discloses counter means for counting up by one when the detecting means detects the first phase connection to the detected network (Fig. 4; Col. 5, ln. 27-30 and 43-48), and

zero determination means that determines whether a subtracting of one from the count of the counter means makes zero when the detecting means detects the first phase connection to the detected network (Col. 6, ln. 52-61),

wherein the zero determination means determines whether the managing means manages the managed profile relating to the detected network detected by the detecting means when the zero determination means determines that subtracting of one from the counter of the counter means makes zero (Col. 6, ln. 52-61),

wherein the establishing means establishes the second phase connection to the detected network in accordance with the managed profile relating to the detected network

while the zero determination means determines that the subtracting of one from the count of the counter means makes zero (Col. 6, ln. 52-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke by examining a counter to determine if registration (i.e. management) of a connection needs to occur as taught by Beck in order to minimize the overhead operations associated with registering (i.e. managing) connections (Beck: Col. 2, ln. 46-52).

19. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Winkler, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0070100 A1.

20. As to claim 7, Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, wherein a second phase connection to the network is established by the establishing means (Blewett: Col. 11, ln. 53 – Col. 12, ln. 18), but are silent on starter means which automatically starts a predetermined software application set by a user when the second phase connection to the network is established by the establishing means.

However, Winkler discloses starter means which automatically starts a predetermined software application set by a user when the second phase connection to the network is established by the establishing means ([0012]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke by automatically starting a predetermined software application set by a user when a connection to the network is established as taught by Winkler in order to authenticate a user and then launch the desired application for the user ([0008]; [0012]).

21. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke as applied to claim 3 above, in view of Koyanagi et al. (Koyanagi), U.S. Publication No. 2001/0013067 A1.

22. As to claim 10, Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 3, wherein said detecting means detects, as said first phase connection, plural connections to plural gateways (Blewett: Fig. 1A), and said establishing means automatically establishes said second phase connection to the gateway of the managed profile (Blewett: Col. 8, ln. 52-55, “automatically translates the destination address and routes the packet to the proper host in the worknet”; Col. 11, ln. 18-32, “rule set assures that only packets from

the protected resource network are accepted from the tunnel, and that only packets bound for worknet are accepted from the tunnel”; Col. 11, ln. 53 – Col. 12, ln. 18).

Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke are silent on establishing a connection to a gateway which has a lowest value of a metric.

However, Koyanagi discloses establishing a connection to a gateway which has a lowest value of a metric (Abstract; [0056]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kavacheri, Blewett, and Stracke by establishing a connection to a gateway which has a lowest value of a metric as taught by Koyanagi in order select an appropriate network for data transmission based on either a lowest data transmission time or a lowest data transmission fee (Koyanagi: [0056]).

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the Notice of References Cited (PTO-892).

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN P. WHIPPLE whose telephone number is (571)270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P. Whipple
/B. P. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2448
11/1/10

/FIRMIN BACKER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2448